



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/965,985 | 09/28/2001 | Ryoji Suzuki | YAO-4346US 5163 | | |
| 7590 11/01/2005 | | EXAMINER | | | |
| Ratner & Prestia | | | CZEKAJ, DAVID J | | |
| One Westlakes, Berwyn Suite 301 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| P.O. Box 980 | | | 2616 | | |
| Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980 | | | DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|--|--|
| 09/965,985 | SUZUKI, RYOJI | SUZUKI, RYOJI | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | - | | |
| Dave Czekaj | 2616 | | | |

| | Dave Czekaj | 2616 | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the | correspondence add | ress | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 15 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | | | | | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). | | | | | | | |
| <u>AMENDMENTS</u> | | | | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | | |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below), (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); | | | | | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a | | ejected claims. | | | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)) | | | (DTG) | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324) | | | | | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling | | | | | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be the non-allowable claim(s). | allowable if submitted in a separate | s, umery med amendn | ient canceling | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-7 and 9-12</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). | | | | | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | | | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) | 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). | | | | | | |
| 13. Other: | | VÜ PRIMARYE | LE XAMINER | | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: On page 3, applicant argues that Branden fails to disclose displaying information relating to the bit rate so that both the video and information are viewable at the same time. While the applicant's points are understood, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner notes that displaying the information so its viewable at the same time is not found in the claim. What is found in the claim is selecting and outputting either the number of bits or the average bit rate in which Branden discloses in figure 9. Therefore the rejection has been maintained.

On pages 3-4, applicant argues that Branden fails to disclose generating a first or second video signal depending on whether a still or moving image is being produced and displaying a picture type number and average bit rate. While the applicant's points are understood, the examiner respectfully disagrees. See for example Branden figure 9. There Branden shows different control keys for producing images. The examiner notes that forwarding through the frames using the previous and next frame keys would simulate still production and forwarding through the GOP's using the previous and next GOP buttons would simulate moving image reproduction. The examiner further notes that Branden displays both the picture type and average bit rate. Therefore the rejection has been maintained.

On page 4, applicant argues that Branden fails to disclose dipslaying a picture type/number of bits simultaneously with still pictures and displaying an average bit rate simultaneously with moving pictures. While the applicant's points are understood, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Displaying the picture type and average bit rate simultaneously with the still and moving pictures is not found in the claim. What is found in the claim is displaying the average bit rate and picture type in which Branden discloses in figure 9. Therefore the rejection has been maintained.

_